



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/670,739	09/26/2003	Nam Young Kong	8734.237.00 US	6763

30827 7590 12/13/2006
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

KOVALICK, VINCENT E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2629

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/670,739	Applicant(s) KONG ET AL.	
	Examiner Vincent E. Kovalick	Art Unit 2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,10,12,17,18,25 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2,4-9,11,13-16,19-24 and 27-30 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 9/26/03 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to Applicant's Patent Application, Serial No. 10/670739, with a File Date of September 26, 2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martinelli et al. (USP 6,239,790) taken with Geaghan et al. (Pub. No. US 2003/0063073).

Relative to claims 1 and 10 Martinelli et al. **teaches** force sensing semiconductive touchpad (col. 1, lines 17-67 and col. 2, lines 1-46); Martinelli et al. further **teaches** a touch panel apparatus comprising: a touch panel for recognizing a contact position on the touch panel; and a touch panel controller for computing a coordinate value corresponding to the contact position on the touch panel, wherein an activation force is set to a value between a specific range (col. 13, lines 60-67; col. 14, lines 1-3 and Abstract).

Martinelli et al. **does not teach** a touch controller compensates for an error of the coordinate value due to double touching of the touch panel.

Geaghan et al. **teaches** a touch panel system and method for distinguishing multiple touch inputs (pgs. 1/2, paras. 0002-0015); Geaghan et al. further **teaches** a touch controller compensates for

Art Unit: 2629

an error of the coordinate value due to double touching of the touch panel (pg. 5, para. 0049 and Abstract).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time or the invention to provide to the device as taught by Martinelli et al. the feature as taught by Geaghan et al. in order to off set the generation of erroneous coordinate values caused by an incidental touching of the touch pad screen.

Regarding claims 3 and 12, Martinelli et al. further **teaches** a touch panel apparatus wherein the activation force is set to a value set between a specified range, within an entire touch area of the touch panel (col. 13, lines 60-67 and col. 14, lines 1-3).

4. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh et al. (Pub. No. US 2002/0113779) taken with Martinelli et al. in view of Geaghan et al.

Relative to claim 17, Itoh et al. **teaches** a pressure sensitive writing tablet control method and control program therefor (pgs. 1/2, paras. 0011-0029); Itoh et al. further **teaches** a method for controlling a touch panel apparatus comprising the steps of: specifying a value for an activation force to be used as a reference for recognizing when the touch panel is touched at a touching position (pg. 6/7, para. 0135).

Itoh et al. **does not teach** computing a coordinate value corresponding to the touching position on the touch panel; and compensating an error of the coordinate value due to double touching of the touch panel.

Martinelli et al. **teaches** computing a coordinate value corresponding to the touching position on the touch panel (col. 13, lines 66-67; col. 14, lines 1-3 and Abstract)

Art Unit: 2629

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time or the invention to provide to the device as taught by Itoh et al. the feature as taught by Martinelli et al. in order to generate a set of coordinates corresponding to the point of contact on the screen of the touch pad screen.

Itoh et al. taken with Martinelli et al. **does not teach** compensating an error of the coordinate value due to double touching of the touch panel.

Geaghan et al **teaches** compensating an error of the coordinate value due to double touching of the touch panel (pg. 5, para. 0049).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time or the invention to provide to the device as taught by Itoh et al. taken with Martinelli et al. the feature as taught by Geaghan et al. in order to offset coordinate errors introduced by the incidental or double touching of the touch screen.

5. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh et al. taken with Martinelli et al. in view of Geaghan et al. as applied to claim 17 in item 4 hereinabove and further in view of Shimizu (Pub No. JP 2002278699).

Regarding claim 18, Itoh et al. taken with Martinelli et al. in view of Geaghan et al. **does not teach** the method step wherein the step of computing includes computing a first coordinate value for a first touch generated in the touch panel and computing a second coordinate value corresponding to a second touch when an input signal corresponding to the second touch is received within a predefined time period.

Shimizu **teaches** a touch panel type input device (Problem Statement); Shimizu further **teaches**

Art Unit: 2629

the method step wherein the step of computing includes computing a first coordinate value for a first touch generated in the touch panel and computing a second coordinate value corresponding to a second touch when an input signal corresponding to the second touch is received within a predefined time period (Abstract text).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time or the invention to provide to the device as taught by Itoh et al. taken with Martinelli et al. in view of Geaghan et al. the feature as taught by Shimizu in order to provide a first coordinate value and a second coordinate value within the predefined time period to substantiate a legitimate touch position on the touch panel.

6. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh et al. taken with Martinelli et al. as applied to claim 17 in item 4 hereinabove, and further in view of Kent (USP 5,854,450).

Relative to claim 25, Itoh et al. taken with Martinelli et al. **does not teach** the method step of rejecting one of a plurality of coordinate values when double touching of the panel generates the plurality of coordinate values.

Kent **teaches** a touch sensitive portions on a touch panel (col. 8, lines 49-67 and col. 9, lines 1-41); Kent further **teaches** the method step of rejecting one of a plurality of coordinate values when double touching of the panel generates the plurality of coordinate values (col. 43, lines 5-24).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time or the invention to provide to the device as taught by Itoh et al. taken with Martinelli et al. the feature as taught by

Art Unit: 2629

Kent in order to provide the means to reject erroneous coordinate values introduced by double touching.

7. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh et al. taken with Martinelli et al. in view Kent as applied to claim 25 in item 6 hereinabove and further in view of Shimizu.

Regarding claim 26, Itoh et al. taken with Martinelli et al. **does not teach** the method step wherein the step of computing includes computing a first coordinate value for a first touch generated in the touch panel and computing a second coordinate value corresponding to a second touch when an input signal corresponding to the second touch is received within a predefined time period.

Shimizu **teaches** a touch panel type input device (Problem Statement); Shimizu further **teaches** the method step wherein the step of computing includes computing a first coordinate value for a first touch generated in the touch panel and computing a second coordinate value corresponding to a second touch when an input signal corresponding to the second touch is received within a predefined time period (Abstract text).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time or the invention to provide to the device as taught by Itoh et al. taken with Martinelli et al. the feature as taught by Shimizu in order to provide a first coordinate value and a second coordinate value within the predefined time period to substantiate a legitimate touch position on the touch panel.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 2, 4-9, 11, 13-16, 19-24 and 27-30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Relative to claims 2 and 11, the major difference between the teachings of the prior art of record Martinelli et al. (USP 6,239,790); Geaghan et al. (Pub. No. US 2003/0063073) and Itoh et al. (Pub. No. US 2002/0113779)) and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** a touch panel wherein a touch area of the touch panel is partitioned into a first region and a second region, and the activation force is set to the value between 80g-150g within the first region of the touch area of the touch panel.

Relative to claims 4 and 13, the major difference between the teachings of the said prior art of record and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** a touch panel apparatus wherein the touch panel controller computes a first coordinate value for a first touch generated in the touch panel, and the touch panel controller computes a second coordinate value corresponding to a second touch and determines whether there is an error in the second coordinate value due to a double touching by comparing the second coordinate value to a preset reference coordinate value when an input signal corresponding to the second touch is received within a predefined time period.

Relative to claims 19 and 27, the major difference between the teachings of the said prior art of record and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** the method

Art Unit: 2629

step of generating a preset reference coordinate value; and determining whether there is an error in the second coordinate value due to a double touching by comparing the second coordinate value to the preset reference coordinate value.

Relative to claim 22, the major difference between the teachings of the said prior art of record and that of the instant invention is that said prior art of record **does not teach** the method step of compensating the error of the coordinate value further includes compensating the second coordinate value in accordance with a difference value from the first coordinate value where there is an error in the second coordinate value due to a double touching.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U. S. Patent No.	6,239,790	Martinelli et al.
U, S. Patent No.	5,341,308	Young
Pub. No.	US 2003/0063073	Geaghan et al.
Pub. No.	US 2002/0180710	Roberts
Pub. No.	US 2002/0175836	Roberts


Art Unit: 2629


To Respond

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vincent E. Kovalick whose telephone number is 571-272-7669. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30- 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on 571-272-7681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Vincent E. Kovalick
December 8, 2006


BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600